

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 10

PETRINA S. HSI HYSEQ, INC. 670 ALMANOR AVENUE SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

COPY MAILED

MAY 0 6 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Shubhada Godbole, Bryan Boyle,
Nancy Mize, Cenhua Deng,
Ryle Goodrich, Matthew Arterburn,
Ping Zhou, Y. Tom Tang,
Chenghua Liu, George Yeung and
Radoje Drmanac
Application No. 09/756,247
Filed: January 8, 2001
Title: INFORMATION PROCESSING
APPARATUS AND METHOD, AND RECORDING:
MEDIUM THEREFOR

DECISION NOTING JOINDER OF INVENTOR AND PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.47(a) MOOT

This is a decision on the "Request for Reconsideration of Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a)," filed May 1, 2003.

The petition is **DISMISSED AS MOOT**.

The above-identified application was filed on January 8, 2001, with an unexecuted declaration. Shubhada Godbole, Bryan Boyle, Nancy Mize, Cenhua Deng, Ryle Goodrich, Matthew Arterburn, Ping Zhou, Y. Tom Tang, Chenghua Liu, George Yeung and Radoje Drmanac were named as joint inventors. In response to a "Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application - Filing Date Granted (Notice)" mailed December 18, 2001, applicants timely filed the initial petition asserting that status under § 1.47 was proper because inventor Godbole refused to join in the application. Accompanying the petition was four separate declarations, identifying all inventors and executed in combination by all of the joint inventors, except inventor Godbole. However, the petition was dismissed for failure to provide adequate proof of the unavailability of inventor Godbole. (Decision mailed March 18, 2003).

On instant request for reconsideration, applicants timely replied with a declaration executed by previously non-signing inventor Godbole. This declaration (considered in combination with the declarations previously filed May 8, 2002) has been reviewed and found in compliance with 37 CFR 1.63 and 1.64.

In view of the joinder of the joint inventor, further consideration under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is not necessary and the petition is considered moot. This application does not have any Rule 1.47(a) status and no such status should appear on the file wrapper. This application need not be returned to this Office for further consideration under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

The application file is being returned to the Office of Initial Patent Examination for completion of pre-examination processing.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-0309.

lancy Johnson

Petitions Attorney Office of Petitions